

PTO/SB/33 (07-05) Approved for use through xx/xx/200x. OMB 0651-00xx

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. Docket Number (Optional) PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW 0879-0249P Application Number Filed 09/492,382-Conf. January 27, 2000 #9804 First Named Inventor Tetsuro ASHIDA Art Unit Examiner J. M. Villecco 2612 Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request. This request is being filed with a notice of appeal. The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s). Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided. I am the applicant /inventor. Signature assignee of record of the entire interest. See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) Marc S. Weiner is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/96) Typed or printed name attorney or agent of record. Registration number (703) 205-8000 Telephone number attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34. 32,181 April 11, 2006 Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34. NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*.

forms are submitted.

*Total of

applying the prior art in rejecting claims 1, 2, and 6-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Moorman* (USP 5,041,911) in view of *Ueno et al.* (USP 5,625,415); and rejecting claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Moorman* in view of *Ueno et al.* (USP 5,625,415); and et al. and further in view of *Jackson et al.* (USP 5,164,836).

The Examiner has Failed to Establish Prima Facie Obviousness by Failing to Provide Adequate Motivation for the Purported Combination

The Examiner has made clear error in asserting there is proper motivation for combining the teachings of *Ueno et al.* with the teachings of *Moorman* to render claims 1, 2, and 6-8 obvious. Applicant maintains that there is no motivation to combine the teachings of the cited references as purported by the Examiner.

In support of the Examiner's rejection of claim 1, the Examiner asserts that *Moorman* discloses a user being able to make a determination as to how well an image is exposed and that a user may make adjustments based upon the output of the gradation-divided area. The Examiner admits that *Moorman* fails to teach a system being able to select a gradation area and correct the image data or the exposure control based on the selected gradation area. The Examiner relies on the teachings of *Ueno et al.* to cure the deficiencies of the teachings of *Moorman* asserting *Ueno et al.* teaches a user being able to select an area within an image to perform exposure control. The Examiner concludes that one skilled in the art would be motivated to allow a user of the camera of *Moorman* to select an area of the color-coded image for which to perform a proper exposure so that the user can compose an image with a proper exposure based on the selected gradation level. Applicant respectfully submits that these references are not properly combinable.

APR 1 1 2006

The disclosure of *Moorman* is directed to an exposure metering system that maps electrical signals into a desired metric for display according to the exposure of individual pixel values of a focused image. In contrast, the disclosure of *Ueno et al.* is directed to a processing apparatus that calculates an exposure value from image data representative of a pre-shot image on the basis of a user selected area. In other words, the user selection of an area as disclosed in *Ueno et al.* takes place pre-shot and prior to when the mapping of *Moorman* takes place. As such, Applicant maintains one skilled in the art would not be motivated to modify the teachings of *Moorman* to provide for enabling selecting a gradation area and correcting the image data or the exposure control based on the selected gradation area, as purported by the Examiner, as *Moorman's* mapping takes place *after* the calculation of an exposure value from image data representative of the pre-shot image.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 2-4 are allowable for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1 at least based upon their dependency on claim 1. It is further respectfully submitted that claims 6 and 7 contain elements similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1 and, thus, these claims, together with claims dependent thereon, are allowable over the references as cited for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1.

Conclusion

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: April 11, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

Marc S. Weiner

Registration No.: 32,181

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Rd

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant